UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/677,493	10/02/2000	Guang Yang		3562

7590 08/12/2003	

George Guang Yang
2235 California Street
#187
Mountain View, CA   94040

EXAMINER
TO, BAOQUOC N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2172	

DATE MAILED: 08/12/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 07-01)

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/677,493	YANG, GUANG
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Baoquoc N To	2172

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____ .

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-7_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-7_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

    If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _11_ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-7 are pending in this application.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments filed 06/02/03 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive.

The applicant argues, "Gill et al. do not teach anything related to relational

database as my invention relates to the integrated data editing system."

The examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant argument because the

pre-amble does not give any patentable weight.

The applicant also argues, "do not explicitly indicate if the file server is located in

the same computer or remote computer through either intranet or Internet."

The examiner respectfully disagrees with the above argument because Gill

discloses the method access to multi-media object files supplied by the file server 28

and provide the staff member client application (col. 4, lines 44-47).

The applicant also argues, "Gill et al. (col. 4, lines 66-67) teach a text editing unit

create and modify the text of a multi-media object which is different from my claim 1 (ii)

where the client computer directly edit the database data without writing details code"

The examiner respectfully disagrees with the above argument because Gill

teaches editing text, which fits the description of the limitation. On the other hand the

claim does not explicitly distinguish if the user can edit the multimedia object without writing code.

The applicant also argues, "Gill et al. (col. 4, line 66, col. 5, lines 1-18, Fig. 1, 64A-D) use the text editor, picture and sound editor to edit the multi-media objects, which is not similar to my claim 1 (iii) where the client computer uses a plurality of commercial text and multimedia data editors to directly edit the large text and binary data types from the database."

The examiner respectfully disagrees with the above argument because these editors can edit text and objects, which are large binary data. Further more, the claim is not clearly defining what the binary object types are.

The applicant also argues, "Gill et al. (col. 8, lines 49-62) use a staff member's logon name and password to control the access to multimedia objects, which is different from my claim 1, (iv) where the user authentication and access control mechanism to the client GUI and the remote database are implemented for the integrated database data editing system."

The examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant argument because this in not in the claim. The claim only claimed data editing system implements the **user authentication and access control mechanism.**

The applicant also argues, "Gill et al . (col. 17, lines 1-5) teach a Hot Text Panel which is different from my claim 2 (i) where the database data on each cell is defaulted as read only."

The examiner respectfully disagrees with the above argument because Gill displays boxes that can be filled with the content (col. 13, 45-57). These boxes are the cells set at default.

The application also argues, "Gill et al. (col. 16, lines 35-40) teaches a picture object and pop-up menu and window which is different from my claim 2 (ii) where the small text data is directly edited by mouse single click."

The examiner respectfully disagrees with the above argument because Gill use the clicking on the text or object to allow the pop-up menu in order to allow the editing the multimedia object.

The applicant also argues that, "Gill et al. teaches the object definition data used to define the multi-media presentation which is different from my claim 2 (iii) where the table cell contains a small icon as a place holder for the large database data types."

The examiner respectfully disagrees with the above argument because the boxes in Gill are placeholders to store the content of the object. And these objects are the large database data type.

The applicant also agues that, "Gill et al. (col. 5, lines 1-33) teach a multi media object retrieval unit connected to a plurality of editing components (editors) which is different from my claim 2 (v) where the type of data editors depends on the database data type.

The examiner respectfully disagrees with the above argument because Gill illustrate authoring tool A to include menus which list the multiple types of media that are available from the media source S1-S6 as well as the editable and presentation characteristics associated with each media type (col. 17, lines 54-60). This clearly indicates that the authoring tool A has menus, which allows to edit the each media types or database types.

The applicant also argues that, "the icons on the left panel to represent the compound documents which is different from my claim 4 where the databases are listed on the header panel."

The examiner respectfully with the above argument because "databases are listed under the header panel" is not in claim. The applicant relies on the specification to and fig. 3 to address the claim but not the claim itself.

The applicant also argues that, "Gill et al. (col. 16, lines 48-49) teach the pop-up menu and window and line implement multi-media which is different from my claim 4 (i) where the detail panel is pop-up to represent a database. Gill et al. (col. 15, lines 5-8) teaches a "hot text" by clicking the mouse which is different from my claim 4 (ii) where is pop-up by mouse double clicking."

The examiner is respectfully disagrees with the above arguments because first of all pop-up menu is the conventional method for editing system. Furthermore, gill uses the pop-up menu to edit the multimedia object by clicking on the object to allow the menu tool to be displayed. In addition to the second argument, the hot text in gill allows the user or developer to click on the text in order to launch the application or menu. These are conventional methods for editing the text, multimedia object or others.

The applicant argues that, "Koppola et al. (fig. 32, 3203, 3204, 3205) teach window application form including menus, left panel and right panel which relates to the different entity as my invention."

The examiner respectfully disagrees with the above argument because Koppola's window application is the standard application for organizing the tools to edit the database.

The applicant argues, "none of them teach the entity as my invention."

The examiner respectfully disagrees with the above argument because Gill teaches the method of editing the multimedia objects on the client/server or internet system but does not discloses the PKI and SSL to protect the data in transferring process. Tepper discloses the system that allows the data to be protected by using PKI and SSL. This combination would allow the vital data to be protected in the processing of transferring from retrieving the data from a sever to be edited. In addition the applicant submits in the argument that Public Key Infrastructure (PKI) technology has been widely used as an industry standard since 1970's and Secure Socket Layer (SSL) is also widely used as an industry for many Internet applications.

The applicant also argues, "Gill et al. teach a multi-media presentation system which is different from my claim 5 where the Detail Panel contains multiple function to remotely access, edit and manage the database."

The examiner respectfully disagrees with the above argument because **remotely access** is not in the claim.

The applicant also argues, "Gill et al. teach a method edit the containee object (such as spreadsheet data) in a word processor which is different from my claim 5 (i) where the DB Designer is used to creating and modifying the remote database through either intranet or Internet."

The examiner respectfully disagrees with the above argument because

"modifying the remote database through either intranet of Internet" is not in claim

5.

The examiner also argues that, "Moursund (Fig. 4G, 112, col. 5, lines 39-45)

teaches the tool bar of the Microsoft Access GUIs with some functions of the Access

database which is different from my claim 5 where all the functions of database Data

Manager Detail Panel are separated from the remote database and are used to

remotely access, edit and mange the database through either intranet or Internet."

The examiner respectfully disagrees with above argument because "all the

functions of database Data Manager access, edit and manage the database through

either internet or Internet" is not in claim 5.

3.   Claims 1-7 are previously rejected.

Conclusion

4.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact Information

5.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Baoquoc N. To whose telephone number is (703) 305-1949 or via e-mail BaoquocN.To@uspto.gov. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday: 8:00 AM – 4:30 PM, EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Y. Vu can be reached at (703) 305-4393.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

·Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231.

The fax numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follow:

- (703) 746-7238   [After Final Communication}]
- (703) 746-7239   [Official Communication]
- (703) 746-7240   [Non-Official Communication]

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to:

Crystal Park II
2121 Crystal Drive
Arlington, VA 22202
Fourth Floor (Receptionist).

Baoquoc N. To

August 7, 2003

JEAN M. CORRIELUS
PRIMARY EXAMINER